City of Lafayette Staff Report

For:	City Council
By:	Leah C. Greenblat, Transportation Planner
Date Written:	April 22, 2008
Meeting Date:	April 28, 2008
Subject:	Draft Lamorinda Action Plan Update

Introduction / Discussion

At its April 14, 2008 meeting, the Council held a joint session with the Circulation Commission and received a presentation on the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan. The April 2, 2008 draft report of the Lamorinda Action Plan Update was provided in your April 14, 2008 agenda packet. Additional copies are available by request at the City Offices.

The Council requested that the Commission prepare comments for your consideration at your next meeting as the comments are due by May 6, 2008. The Commission met on April 21, 2008 to prepare its comments, attached. The Commission agreed with all of the staff comments previously provided and added more beginning at comment #30. The Commission additionally received several pieces of correspondence, attached, that it also recommends forwarding along with the City's comment letter.

Fiscal Impact

None.

Recommendation

1. Forward attached draft letter, table of comments and correspondence on the April 2, 2008 Draft Lamorinda Action Plan Update.

Attachments

1. Draft cover letter to Mike Metcalf, LPMC Chair
2. Circulation Commission's table of comments
3. Miscellaneous correspondence

c:\users\lgreenblat\documents\leah's work files\circulation commission\reports to council\2008\comments on drft lamorinda action plan update.doc

April 22, 2008

Mike Metcalf, LPMC Chair
c/o Calvin Wong, LPMC Staff Contact
Town of Moraga
PO Box 188
Moraga, CA 94556

Dear Chair Metcalf:

The City of Lafayette is pleased to forward you our comments, attached, on the April 2, 2008 Draft Report of the Lamorinda Action Plan Update. During a joint session on April 14, 2008, the City Council and Circulation Commission received a presentation on the draft update. The Lafayette Circulation Commission discussed the draft update at its April 21, 2008 meeting and forwarded comments to the City Council which we considered on April 28, 2008. Additionally, we received several pieces of correspondence, attached, on this matter which we are also forwarding for your information.

As the Lamorinda Program Management Committee reviews our comments and those from other jurisdictions as well as draft Action Plans from other regions, it is imperative to be continually vigilant of the cumulative downstream impacts that will occur on Lamorinda's Routes of Regional Significance and carryover to our local roadways.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft update and to shape our community's transportation future.

Sincerely,

Mike Anderson
Mayor

Enclosure
cc: Don Tatzin, Lafayette Councilmember,
Martin Engelmann, CCTA
Bill Loudin, DKS
Leah Greenblat, Lafayette Transportation Planner

City of Lafayette Circulation Commission Comments on the Circulation Draft of the Lamorinda Action Plan Update
April 22, 2008

#	Location	Comment/Question	Suggested Revision	
1.	Pg. 3, ¶6	The LFFA operates under a Joint Exercise of Powers Authority	"…a Joint *Exercise* of Powers Authority (JEPA) …	
2.	Pg. 4, ¶2&3	Chapter 2 and 3 both identify Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives. Why identify the same MTSOs twice? Is there a difference between them? If so, specify it.		
3.	Pg. 7, Item 11	Springhill Elementary and Acalanes High School are both on PHR. The road is also part of the bikeway network. Pedestrian and bicycle safety should not be compromised to accommodate regional traffic.	"Efficiency improvements…are important, *but not at the risk of compromising pedestrian and bicycle safety."*	
4.	Pg. 7, ¶SR 24, Item 3	Clarify that the 1.5 BART loading factor is for any given hour, not an average of all hours.		
5.	Pg. 7, ¶PHR, Items 3 &4	Could a maximum wait time for drivers on side streets result in an increase in the delay index; therefore the 2 statements cancel each other out?	Revise statements to avoid ambiguity.	
6.	Pg. 12, ¶5	County Connection provides limited service within Lamorinda.	"The stations can be accessed through…*several* ~~numerous~~ County Connection bus routes.	
7.	Pg. 13, Table 1	Footnote #1 is not provided.		
8.	Pg. 16, Section 3.3.3	The Lamorinda Spirit Van provides supplemental paratransit service. Add a paragraph describing this service.		
9.	Pg. 17, Section 4.1	It is unclear what is contributing to the future growth. Is it Seniors aging in place? Living longer? It must be something else too since new households are also forming?	Add additional descriptive information explaining the nature of the anticipated growth.	
10.	Pg. 19, Section 4.3	How is a "moderate" pace growth in traffic demand defined? Table 5 shows the growth at 30% on PHR, the highest of all segments forecasted.	Provide more context for what is "moderate". Clearly state factors contributing to this growth rate.	
11.	Pg. 20, Table 6	Will these MTSO values change as the MTSO's in other Action Plans are added to the model? As a downstream jurisdiction, it	Add reference to later discussion on pages 25-25.	

#	Location	Comment/Question	Suggested Revision	
		would seem that Lafayette would need to understand the cumulative impacts of the upstream Action Plans before finalizing the Lamorinda Action Plan.		
12.	Page 21, Chapter 5	Organizationally, Chapter 5 might benefit by using a similar section numbering system as deployed in other chapters.		
13.	Pg. 21, ¶2 and Tables 7-9	It is staff's understanding that the Lamorinda jurisdictions have not been responsible or funded the monitoring of the MTSOs in the past; yet the first sentence implies a change. This section and/or Tables 7-9 should be revised to clearly state who has what responsibility, particularly for the funding of the monitoring program.		
14.	Pg. 21, ¶2	In the second to last sentence, the list of actions implies that they should occur only north of Lafayette. The proposed actions would also be beneficial if implemented along the I-680 corridor to the south of SR 24.	"Actions such as … building park-n-ride lots north of Lafayette *and along the I-680 corridor south of SR 24* are proposed" Revise other portions of the draft plan to reflect this change.	
15.	Pg. 21, ¶2	The last sentence might imply that pedestrian and bicycle safety is not an issue on 2 out of 3 routes. As noted above, non-motorized safety is an issue on PHR. Additionally, the many SR 24 on and off ramps within Lamorinda raise potential safety and access concerns as well.		
16.	Pg. 22, Item 9	The recent Lafayette Downtown Employee-Employer survey showed that a significant number of employees commuted from north and east of Lafayette. Given the existing lack of transit service linking these areas to Lafayette, the City should also be supportive of expanding regional bus service in these areas as well, especially those not served by BART.	More actions need to be considered to address traffic generated to the north and northeast of Lafayette. At a minimum, revise proposed Action #9 or add a new Action to support expanding regional transit service to communities north and northeast of Lafayette such as Concord, Pleasant Hill, Martinez and Antioch.	
17.	Pg. 23, Table 8	Pedestrian and bicycle safety along PHR are not sufficiently addressed. Specific actions supporting non-motorized transportation safety, particularly around schools, trailheads and	*Support pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements around schools, trailheads, and at intersections and along the bikeway network.*	

#	Location	Comment/Question	Suggested Revision	
		at intersections should be added.		
18.	Pg. 23, Table 8	An assessment of future transportation needs within Lamorinda, especially in light of the forecasted increase in the senior population should be addressed in the proposed actions.	*Develop a Lamorinda Transit Plan to identify future community transit needs and to address the changing needs of the senior population.*	
19.	Pg. 26, ¶1	Have other RTPC's other than SWAT utilized gateway constraints?	List other locations within Contra Costa County where gateway restraints have been used.	
20.	Pg. 26, ¶3	The proposed westbound, four-lane cross section to be retained as a gateway occurs on SR-24, west of PHR, not I-680.	"The four-lane cross section of ~~I-680~~ *SR-24* Westbound, just west of the PHR Off-ramp, is proposed as a Gateway Constraint."	
21.	Pg. 27, ¶1	Due to the road grade on portions of PHR, the future location of the Gateway Constraint may need to occur north of Rancho View Dr. near the Taylor-PHR merge. Revise the location description.	"The two southbound through lanes on Pleasant Hill Road-*Taylor Boulevard* are proposed as a Gateway Constraint (Location to be Determined)"	
22.	Pg. 27, Traffic Management Strategies	Why is there no italicized section summarizing the strategies similar to what was provided for the Gateway Policies?		
23.	Pg. 29, ¶1	Since Lamorinda has no reciprocity agreements currently in place to mitigate the impacts of new development that occurs outside of Lamorinda, should the Action Plan contain actions to develop such agreements with upstream RTPCs?		
24.	Pg. 30, Bullet 1¶	Receipt of an application does not always mean complete information. Once an application is deemed complete, then that would be an appropriate time to notify others. This section should also specify that it is the Planning Directors for each jurisdiction who will receive the notification for developments generating 10-50 peak hour trips.		
25.	Pg. 30, Bullet 3	In the case of a project that generates 50 or more trips, a jurisdiction should notify the Lamorinda Planning Directors and the staff liaisons to LPMC.		
26.	Pg. 31, Table 10	Some of the ITE Land Use Categories used in this table do not reflect the type of development that typically occurs in Lamorinda. The example provided for Condos (ITE #230) has average trip generation rates of .44 in the AM and .52 in the PM.	Revise Table 10 to use the trip generation rates for ITE's Land Use Category for Low Rise Condos (#231).	

#	Location	Comment/Question	Suggested Revision	
		The Low Rise Condo rate (ITE #231) specifies an average AM rate of .68 and .78 in the PM. Using these, more appropriate trip generation rates, would result in the 50 trip threshold being met with a 64 unit project versus the 96 unit project cited in the table. In the current addition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual, the variation in trip generation rates among various apartment types is significantly less. The ITE rates generally do not vary by proximity to transit, mixed use development or highways. So a low rise condo. project built near BART could have the same ITE trip generation rate as a project built in a more isolated location where transit is not available and vehicle use would be more likely.	Additional information should be added stating that these trip generation rates are only a guide and may need to be adjusted to fit the specific type of project proposed.	
27.	Pg. 32, ¶3	The draft plan states, "In certain cases, the MTSOs, as forecasted, may exceed their prescribed thresholds under growth already included in the adopted general plans." How would a jurisdiction or LPMC know how much of the growth is accounted for? Practically speaking, how would the forecasted exceedance be separated from the proposed exceedance?		
28.	Pg. 32, ¶(b-c)	Clarify if the CCTA is also responsible for items b and c. Where will the funding for these review and focused plans come from?		
29.		Average Daily Traffic counts on Pleasant Hill Road should be collected and included in the plan in order to measure changes in volumes that may warrant implementation of the Plan's actions.	Collect ADT volumes on 1. Taylor Blvd. north of the merge with PHR, 2. Pleasant Hill Rd., south of the merge with Taylor Blvd., 3. Pleasant Hill Rd. north of Stanley Blvd., and 4. Pleasant Hill Rd. north of the SR24 on and off ramps.	
30.		The latest ABAG Housing Allocations (2007) may have some impact on future housing distribution patterns that are not accounted for in the older ABAG numbers used in the draft Plan.	Add a paragraph explaining how the latest ABAG numbers may effect the information and conclusions discussed in the draft plan.	
31.	Pg. 17-19	Telecommuters, home-based employment and local residents employed locally create different commute habits and transportation patterns than "typical" commuters. Lafayette has a	Add additional descriptive information about the various modes of commuting, especially within Lamorinda, and how the location of employment	

#	Location	Comment/Question	Suggested Revision	
		large number of these types of workers, yet the draft plan generically discusses employment growth and traffic. For example, a home-based business or telecommuter may be more likely to generate trips during non-peak hours.	may effect transportation patterns locally.	
32.	Pg. 20, Table 6	A 2030 Baseline showing a 229% increase in ridership warrants an explanation in the body of the document. LOS should be calculated for key intersections on PHR in order to establish baseline figures in order to evaluate the future need for implementation of gateway constraints.	Add information explaining the large increase in ridership. Calculate the LOS for the following intersections: Stanley/Deer Hill, Springhill/Quandt, Reliez Valley and Rancho View.	
33.	Pg. 23-27	Tables 7-9 imply that all of the new actions are listed within those tables, yet new actions (gate constraints and traffic management strategies) are discussed later in the chapter.	The actions discussed under proposed Gateway Constraint Policies and Traffic Management Strategies should be included in the summary tables 7-9 so that these tables contain all of the proposed actions.	
34.	Pg. 26-27	Local success of gateway constraint and traffic management strategies in order to maintain downstream roadway capacity for Lamorinda is dependent on maintaining local control of decisions and signal operations.	The plan should include language to clarify that gateway constraints and traffic management strategies considered for specific routes within Lamorinda shall be determined only by a vote of locally elected officials at locally, noticed public hearing.	
35.	Pg. 27, Traffic Management Strategies	The reference to "ramp metering" creates a possible misrepresentation of the intended traffic management strategies. Freeway ramp metering is not desired on any Route of Regional Significance within Lamorinda. While ramp metering is a type of traffic management strategy, it is not an appropriate component of this plan.	Delete the reference to "ramp metering."	
36.	Pg. 31, Table 10		Cite the year of the ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition.	

Lynn's Comments per the Draft *Lamorinda Action Plan* 2008

I have the following comments per the Draft *Lamorinda Action Plan*, particularly as it affects Lafayette's Pleasant Hill Road and Hwy 24:

General:

- Removing the "ed" from all "forecasted" words. "Forecast" is correct in both present and past tense as it reads. [It is not only incorrect English but awkward to attempt to add an "ed" for good measure.]

- Plan to conduct a study on car ownership and usage within the Town Centre existing condos for use in Lafayette's own Downtown Specific Plan trip projections.

- Adjust CCTA growth and trip projections to account for the new travel patterns that will be created by the new 2007 ABAG Housing Allocation revisions. As a result of these revised distribution patterns, LMO roads will be more impacted than previously anticipated (in 2005 when the information within this Action Plan was collected.

Introductory language should state, as Martin Engleman affirmed, that all use figures and projections are based upon studies done by the CCTA in *2005 (three years prior)*.

1. I believe page 17, Para. 2 under *Population Forecasts* to be an incorrect assumption. It reads, in part: "Since there are currently fewer employees than employed residents, the net out-commuting travel pattern that exists today will likely continue." The last part of that sentence may be true but not necessarily as result of accepting the first part. No mention has been made of the high frequency of telecommuting taking place in Lafayette, significantly high enough for Bay Area cities that Lafayette's high telecommuting numbers were was cited in the *SF Chronicle* over a year ago. This fact, in combination with the known high numbers of telecommuting from homes of which many of us are aware, calls for inclusion of comments citing such a use. It may very well account for less out-commuting but considerably more internal trips between the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

2. Page 18, Para. 1, *Employment Forecasts*, I would recommend defining what is meant by "employment". Are telecommuters considered "employees"? Or are only commuters, either in or out, considered "employees". How are telecommuters accounted for in these figures? In the bottom para., if a person is employed at home, telecommuting, in Lafayette, is that person an employee and is his or her job a "Lafayette job"? If these are those, then there are probably far more "Lafayette jobs" being created than the writers of these and other studies and graphs have considered.

3. Page 19, Figure 10, *Employment Growth by Area*, showing Lafayette very high. Source, *CCTA Travel Demand Model projections 2005*. This model

should give some indication of understanding that just because a person is employed in Lafayette, there is not necessarily a hit on the Travel Demand Model projections. In addition, a second point should be made: Due to the 2007 revised ABAG Housing Allocations changing the allotment patterns within the County to a distribution more heavily allotted to cities with BART stations, LMO roads, including RRS within LMO, will be impacted differently, and probably more heavily by this revision that occurred following the 2005 studies done by the CCTA.

4. Page 19, table 5, *Peak Volume %age growth between 2000 and 2030* , the PH/Deer Hill intersection is shown to be the highest increase of any of the SR 24/Deer Hill/Orinda counts taken, that of 30% (southbound). This usage number should be conveyed to the Lafayette Planning Commission as it attempts to determine zoning for the NW and SW properties fronting Deer Hill/Pleasant Hill roads.

5. Page 20, Table 6, shows a 2030 baseline increase of 229%. Indicate what this figure stands for. In addition, Lafayette baseline figures for PH Rd intersections are needing updating and inclusion herein, footnoted as 2008 figures.

6. Page 25, *Proposed Gateway Constraint Policy*, these policies recommended for consideration should be included in the tables on pp 23 and 24 as tentative proposals. LMO residents should be able to look at these tables and not find such considerations missing.

7. Page 26, Pleasant Hill Road, *Proposed Gateway Constraints for Specific Routes*- we should know by now that regarding traffic, at least, what goes around, comes around. If we constrain traffic on PH Rd in Lafayette southbound, we can count on Pleasant Hill's setting up similar constraints northbound, with potential for backing up traffic as it flows off the freeway (Hwy 24) during the evening peak rush hours. Lafayette's two schools located on PH Rd would have their air quality impacted by particulate from idling motors. I would recommend treading very lightly in any consideration of these recommendations.

8. Per pp 26 and 27, recommend stating clearly that any "gateway constraints" or "traffic management strategies" to be considered for specific routes within the LMO area shall be determined by a vote of locally elected officials as result of a well-noticed, locally conducted, local jurisdiction's public hearing, *only*.

9. Page 27, per ramp metering: Don't even think about it. The impact of ramp metering anywhere along Lafayette's or Orinda's portion of Hwy 24 would be devastating to the few access roads that Lafayette does have, its infrastructure is so constrained, even now.

10. Page 30, *Procedures for Notification, Review and Monitoring* – can wording be included to deal with, say, several projects with under 50 new peak hour vehicle trips? There needs to be some method to keep jurisdictions from suffering from a nickel-and-dime-ing process that would throw enough un-notified projects to slip through to outstrip one that did "required submittal" to the sub-regionals. This cumulative trip-dumping has been a constant, undealt with problem since Measure C was passed in 1988.

11. Page 31, Table 100. Cite what year was this ITE Trip Generation chart published. Is there anything more current that can be used? If so, recommend using it. The trip assignments are unrealistic for Lamorinda. For example, suggesting that 50 single family dwelling units would create 38 a.m. trips and 51 p.m. trips is not befitting our area. We get tallies of as many as 20 car trips per day per family. (My own daughter's family, with two adults –both telecommuting--and 3 teen drivers in the family, tallied 28 on the day I called to ask.) Lafayette should conduct its own trip generation study to learn what Lafayette's numbers, with its residents coming out of hilly terrain, actually are. As for the hotels, the trip generations seem not to anticipate parties, celebrations, wedding, funerals, etc.

12. Page 32, state whether or not cities drafting Downtown Specific Plans will need to pass their General Plan Amendments past the sub-regionals and CCTA for permission to incorporate them into their GPs.

13. Leah's chart item 9. Indicate the number of new sr housing units being built in the Lafayette downtown and whether these numbers are attributable to those.

14. Include wording as above (locally conducted, locally held, locally decided, public hearing) per the *Constraints and Strategies* portion of the draft recommendations under consideration.

15. Leah's chart, page 31, Leah's para 3, states: *"The ITE rates generally do not vary by proximity to transit, mixed use development or highways. So a low rise condo project built near BART could have the same ITE trip generation rate as a project built in a more isolated location where transit is not available and vehicle use would be more likely."* It would help if the chart recommends that in order to learn trip generation rates pertinent to Lafayette's Bart station, a study be done of the existing Town Center condominiums to learn how many of those residents own cars, where they drive or don't, whether they go to work or play or appts or shopping by Bart or car, bike, walk, etc., and other pertinent facts upon which the Lafayette Downtown Specific Plan can make some accurate assumptions pertaining to Lafayette. If we don't do this, we will have none and only guesswork.

Thank you for your consideration,
Lynn Hiden